REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-17, 19-21, 23-25 and 27-38 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Summary of the Interview

Applicant's representatives thank Examiner Rayyan for the courtesy of an interview on Monday, May 19, 2008. In the interview, proposed newly added features in the independent claims were discussed with an emphasis on the disclosure by Ortega (US6564213). Applicant's representatives presented distinctions based on these features as discussed further herein in this reply. Examiner Rayyan seemed to agree that the presented amendments to the independent claims may differentiate from Ortega.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 has been canceled, rendering the objections thereof moot. Claims 1, 3, 6-7, 10, 12-15, 17, 19-20, 33 and 34 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ortega** (U.S. 6,564,213) and **Gross** (U.S. 2004/0143564) and **Liu** (U.S. 2003/0225756). Claims 5, 21, 23-25, 27-28, and 35-36 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Liu in view of **Van Vleet** (U.S. 2006/0112178). Claims 4 and 16 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Liu in view of **Bowman** (U.S. 6,006,225). Claim 29 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Liu in view of Van Vleet in view of **Chan** (U.S. 2006/0129915). Claims 11, 30-32 and 37 are objected to under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Ortega and Gross and Liu in view of **Valk** (U.S. 2003/0182463). The Applicant respectfully traverses the instant § 103 objections.

In the interest of simplifying prosecution of the instant application, the Applicant's reply focuses on the independent claims. Applicant's decision not to address differences between the cited references and every claim limitation of every independent claim or every comment made by the Examiner in regards to the independent claims should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the Examiner's interpretations and assertions regarding the independent claims.

Also, the patentability of each dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, Applicant's decision not to address the differences between the cited references and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the Examiner's assertions regarding the patentability of the dependent claims over the cited references.

1. **INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 13, 21, 25, and 30**

   a. **Ortega and Liu do not teach replacement**

   Pending independent claim 1 states, *inter alia*:

   > ... wherein the one or more suggested query refinement options includes at least one of (a) a synonym suggestion for **replacing** the detected defined query related character pattern in a query, or (b) a broadening suggestion for **replacing** the detected defined query related character patter in the query to broaden the query,
   >   wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern;
   > (emphasis added)

Claim 1 refers to a "query related character pattern". Claims 13 and 25 recite similar features referring to "query defining characters". Claim 21 recites a similar feature referring to "query defining word". Claim 30 recites a similar feature referring to "query related character pattern". For simplicity, these terms will collectively be referred to as "QUERY" for this Reply.

In rejecting to claim 1, the Office Action refers to sections in Ortega that discuss autocompletion:

:

> For example, if Pokemon products are currently the best selling items within the databse 22, the term POKEMON may be suggested whenever a user enters the letters "PO", even though many hundreds of other items in the database may have **names that start with "PO"**. *See*, Ortega, column 4, lines 19-23 (emphasis added).
>
> FIGS. 2(a) and 2(b) illustrate the general form of a user interface that may be used by the **autocompletion** client 50 for both PCs and handheld computing devices. In this example, as the user enters a search query into a search field 60 of the Amazon.com web site (by voice, stylus, etc.), the **autocompletion** client displays suggested **autocompletion** terms and phrases in a drop-down box 62. *See*, Ortega, column 5, lines 23-29 (emphasis added).

The Office Action incorrectly equates the suggested QUERY **replacement** options in the independent claims of the present application with the suggested **autocompletion** terms described in Ortega at column 5 lines 28-29.

Ortega fails to disclose a method of query refinement as recited in the amended independent claims. The examiner is respectfully reminded that autocompletion refers to the **completion** of partially written words or phrases. Ortega is replete with references to and examples of **autocompletion**. For instance, the patent title in Ortega is "SEARCH QUERY **AUTOCOMPLETION.**" Figures 2A and 2B in Ortega show exclusively

autocompletion suggestions which being with the QUERY. Ortega Figures 5 and 6 disclose a tree structure wherein the final results support only autocompletion, i.e. the results are continuations of the partially-completed word or phrase of the parent node. As such, **Ortega only refers to autocompletion, not replacement** as recited in the independent claims. What is more, Ortega actually <u>teaches away</u> from consideration of replacement suggestions that do not begin with the same characters at column 4 lines 21-24: "the term POKEMON may be suggested whenever a user enters the letters 'PO', even though many hundreds of other items in the database may have names that start with 'PO'"In the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the additional limitation "wherein neither the synonym suggestion nor the broadening suggestion begins with the query related character pattern." This amendment is well supported in the as-filed specification. For example, Figure 8B element 111, shows one of the replacement options as "health and fitness", which does not begin with "gym subscription".

Applicants submit that Ortega fails to teach or disclose replacement suggestions for a QUERY, wherein the replacement suggestions do not begin with the query related character pattern.

Furthermore, Liu does not teach replacement. In rejection claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Liu teaches a synonym or broadening suggestion for the QUERY, referring to Liu Figure 3 ref. no. 185 and ref. no. 183, and paragraphs 27 and 34 (broader terms added to search), to "automatically provide **additional** and meaningful search criteria to a search query". (emphasis added) The Office Action objections for independent claims 13, 21, 25, and 30 stated, *inter alia*, substantially the same reference and objection.

The Office Action equates the synonym or broadening **replacement** suggestions in the independent claims with the **additional** search terms disclosed in Liu. The

independent claims in the present application indicate that the suggestions are replacements for the QUERY, not additional search terms. In contrast, Liu discloses only the addition of terms to the search. **Liu clearly states that the additional terms is an addition, not a replacement**(*See* Para [0034], "all of the search terms are sent"; Para [0035], "by ANDing the broader term"; Para [0035], "and any related terms"; Para [0036], "the addition of the synonym (UF or ALT) "Mars" produced 39 relevant pages"). Therefore, Liu fails to teach or disclose replacement suggestions for a QUERY.

Because the deficiencies of Ortega and Liu are not cured by any of the cited references (alone or in any reasonable combination) the Office Action fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the independent claims. Pending dependent claims distinguish for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims in addition to adding further limitations of their own. For at least the reasons cited above, applicant has traversed the objections to independent claims 1, 13, 21, 25, and 30, and pending dependent claims 3-7, 10-12, 14-17, 19-20, 23-24, 27-29, and 31-38.

b. Gross does not teach predefined time delay

Pending independent claim 13 states, *inter alia* (emp. added):

> ... each time entry of a query defining word is detected ... wherein the query defining word includes a string of characters followed by **a predefined time delay** before additional characters are entered by the user.

In objecting to claim 13, the Office Action stated on pages 6 and 7, *inter alia* (emp. added):

> [Gross teaches] the query defining word includes a string of characters followed by a predefined time delay ... (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as **immediately** after each character in a search string is entered by the user the user receives **immediate feedback** ....

The Office Action equates the predefined time delay in claim 13 with the immediate feedback in Gross. Pending claim 13 includes the feature of a predetermined time delay occurring after a set of character is entered. For a predetermined time delay to exist, there must be a **delay** in time, and that delay must be **predetermined** in some manner. In sharp contrast, Gross discloses at Para [0010] *inter alia*:

> Para [0010], emphasis added:
> ... the search results are provided or narrowed **substantially immediately** after each character in a search string is entered by a user. Thus, the user is provided with **substantially immediate** feedback as the search string is being entered, ...

Applicant respectfully submits that "substantially immediate" does not constitute a predetermined time **delay**. Applicant further submits that, assuming *arguendo* that "substantially immediate" could be a time delay, Gross neither teaches nor discloses any **predetermined** time delay. Therefore, the Office Action does not address all the limitations of claim 13.

Because the deficiencies of Gross are not cured by **any** of the cited references (alone or in any reasonable combination) the Office Action fails to make a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to currently submitted independent claim 13. For at least the reasons cited above, applicant has traversed the objections to independent claim 13 and related dependent claims 14-17, 19-20, and 34.

2. DEPENDANT CLAIM 28

Claim 28 includes the feature "wherein the query refinement option list is semi-transparent". The Office Action, in rejecting claim 28, cited to Ortega Figure 2A, Ref. No. 62. However, neither Ortega Figure 2A nor the related text in Ortega's specification at column 5, lines 27-36 relate to semi-transparent features. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses this objection for at least the additional reason of not addressing all the limitations of Claim 28.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the objections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this reply is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: June 19, 2008   By: /Pablo Tapia/

Pablo Tapia, Reg. No.: 52,275
Direct telephone (425) 707-0058
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
 (Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

June 19, 2008   /Noemi Tovar/
Date   Noemi Tovar

Reply to Office Action mailed March 19, 2008
Application Number: 10/749,936
Attorney Docket Number: 306397.01